

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 6, 8, 9 and 13 are amended, and claims 14-20 are added to recite additional features disclosed in the specification at, for example, Figs. 1-3 and paragraphs [0045] and [0053].

The specification is amended to clarify the subject matter described in Fig. 2 and paragraphs [0045] and [0053] as originally filed. The amendments to the specification are based on Examiner Tran's suggestion during a June 15, 2006 personal interview. As Examiner Tran indicated, these amendments to the specification do not introduce new matter.

Applicant thanks Examiner Tran for the courtesy extended to Applicant's representative, Mr. Luo, during the June 15, 2006 personal interview. The substance of the personal interview is incorporated in this response.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3 and 6-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,690,110 to Yamada et al. ("Yamada"); and rejects claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamada in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,825,820 to Yamazaki et al. ("Yamazaki"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is amended to recite that at least a part of a second wiring line is disposed between an effective region and a first side of a first substrate, and that a second substrate is provided at a second side of the first substrate opposite from the first side of the first substrate. Claim 13 is similarly amended. Yamada and Yamazaki do not disclose or suggest these features.

As discussed during the personal interview, Yamada discloses a "vertical driver." (See Fig. 3A.) However, the "vertical driver" is not located above an effective display region. Thus, the "vertical driver" is not disposed between an effective display region and a first side

of a substrate above the effective display region, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claim 13.

During the personal interview, the element "horizontal driver" shown in Fig. 3 of Yamada was discussed. The "horizontal driver" is not connected to a common electrode. Therefore, as discussed during the personal interview, the "horizontal driver" does not disclose or suggest the second wiring line recited in claims 1 and 13, because the second wiring line recited in claims 1 and 13 acts as a common electrode.

The subject matter recited in claims 1 and 13 is not obvious in view of Yamada and Yamazaki. As discussed during the personal interview, the features associated with the second wiring line, as recited in claims 1 and 13, are advantageous over the disclosure of Yamada. For example, the configuration of the second wiring line uses the space between the first side of the first substrate and the effective display region, has a larger area, and obtains a low resistance. See the specification at, for example, paragraph [0048]. Such a configuration prevents a problem associated with a serious voltage drop due to high resistance of the second wiring line. See the specification at, for example, paragraph [0047]. Yamada does not identify the above-discussed problem, and does not disclose or suggest any advantage of preventing such a problem.


For any or all of the above reasons, Yamada does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1 and 13. Also, Yamazaki does not supply the subject lacking in Yamada. Therefore, Yamada and Yamazaki, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1 and 13, and claims 2-12 depending therefrom. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 16-20 are each patentable at least in view of the patentability of claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for additional features they recite. Also, new claims 14 and 15 are believed to be patentable over Yamada and Yamazaki.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Gang Luo
Registration No. 50,559

JAO:GXL/gck

Attachment:
Amendment Transmittal

Date: July 10, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--